REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-18 are all the claims pending in the application.

At page 2 of the Action, claims 1, 2 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. (JP 10-204355) in view of Jones et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,936,008), Ishii et al. (JP 10-203039), Chocholaty et al (U.S. Pat. No. 4,130,126) and Love, III (U.S. Pat. No. 4,718,340).

Further, at page 3 of the Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al., Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Masaaki (JP 58-147,373). In addition, claims 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al., Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Arway et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,555,712).

Still further, at page 4 of the Action, claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al., Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Ikkatai (U.S. Pat. No. 5,363,132), and claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al., Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Gasparrini (U.S. Pat. No. 5,322,015).

Lastly, at page 5 of the Action, claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al., Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Miura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,988,782), and claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kato et al. in view of Jones et al.,

Ishii et al., Chocholaty et al and Love, and further in view of Mayrhofer et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,846,065).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the following reasons.

1. The present invention is not *prima facie* obvious over the cited references because there is no motivation to combine Jones et al with Kato et al

The image formation method of Jones et al consists of performing an inkjet image formation with dots of about 2 pl of an aqueous ink, and fixing it by means of a heat roller. In contrast, the image formation method of Kato et al consists of performing an inkjet image formation with dots of about 0.1 pl of an oily ink, and fixing it by means of a fuser fixation. The two methods have different image formation mechanisms and resolutions different from each other by more than one order of magnitude. For this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Jones et al with Kato et al.

2. The present invention is not obvious over the cited references because it provides unexpectedly superior results

Even if there might be motivation to combine Jones et al with Kato et al, any *prima facie* case of obviousness would have been overcome because the present invention provides unexpected superior results.

Applicants submit herewith a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.132 which demonstrates the unexpected superiority of the present invention as set forth below and thus establishes the patentability of the present invention.

In the Declaration, comparative experiments were conducted by using the methods of Jones et al, Kato et al and the present invention. Printing press was evaluated in each method and the results are summarized in the table below:

Data of the Experiment

Ink	Fixing Method	Image Quality	Printing Press (shown in each Example)	Notes
Aqueous Ink	Heat roller fixing	Poor: dots of about 2pl. droplet	500 sheets or less	Invention set forth in Jones
Oily Ink	Fuser fixing	High: dots of about 0.1 pl. droplet	3,000 sheets	Invention set forth in Kato
	Heat roller fixing		10,000 sheets or more	The present invention

As the results show, the method of the heat roller fixing for an aqueous ink as disclosed in Jones et al produces 500 sheets or less in poor image quality. The method of the fuser fixing for an oily ink as disclosed in Kato et al produces 3000 sheets or less in high image quality. In contrast, the present invention of the heat roller fixing for an oily ink produces 10,000 sheets or more in high image quality.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of other cited references rectifies the deficiencies of Jones et al and Kato et al.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentable over the cited references and the rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Fang Liu
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 25, 2004